

Royal Titles from the Mesopotamian Periphery

Author(s): William W. Hallo

Source: *Anatolian Studies*, Vol. 30, Special Number in Honour of the Seventieth Birthday of Professor O. R. Gurney (1980), pp. 189-195

Published by: [British Institute at Ankara](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3642789>

Accessed: 22/12/2010 14:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=biaa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



British Institute at Ankara is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Anatolian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ROYAL TITLES FROM THE MESOPOTAMIAN PERIPHERY

By WILLIAM W. HALLO

Much attention is currently lavished on the roles of the Mesopotamian core area relative to those of the periphery which surrounded it in a great arc.¹ The periphery drew much of its cultural inspiration from the core, but not in any kind of monolithic way: present indications are that it was more often open to influence from what might be termed "Akkadian" than "Sumerian" traditions. In matters of script, language, calendar, legal terminology and numerous other features, it seems to have perpetuated innovations ultimately going back to Sargonic rule or inspiration. But it is equally clear that the direction of influence was not exclusively outward from the core to the periphery. As the example of the geographical atlas of the Ancient Near East attested at Ebla and at Abū Salābīk has already shown, it sometimes went the other way.² The case of the royal titulary may provide a further example of the influence of the periphery on the Mesopotamian core.

Twenty-five years ago, I studied the evolution of the royal titulary in essentially historical terms, as I attempted to date the first appearance of each royal title within Mesopotamia.³ Only occasional suggestions were offered for the possible prehistory of some titles outside Mesopotamia.⁴ These suggestions can now be followed up and expanded in the light of additional data.

In general it may be said that the royal titles first attested in Early Dynastic Mesopotamia⁵ continue to be at home there, owing no demonstrable debt to any foreign precedent; they are, indeed, part and parcel of the indigenous evolution of the royal office in its characteristic forms, and are more often than not themselves models for later features of kinship in many parts of the world.⁶ Beginning with Sargonic times, however, this situation changes significantly.

If we may ignore the later traditions about Lugalannemundu of Adab,⁷ the first great innovator in respect of the royal titulary was Naram-Sin of Akkad. To begin with, he introduced the concept of the kingship of the four quarters, i.e., the "four regions of the inhabited world".⁸ This concept no doubt reflected the rule over the native lands (k i) of Sumer and Akkad combined with the conquest of such foreign lands (k u r) as Subartu, Amurru and Elam.⁹ It was translated into purely geographical terms in the first millennium formulations in which Elam, Subartu, Amurru and Akkad represented east, north, west and south

¹ See the forthcoming report of the 25th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, devoted to "Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn".

² See Giovanni Pettinato, "The royal archives of Tell Mardikh-Ebla", *Biblical Archaeologist* 39 (1976) 52; *idem*, "L'Atlante geografico del Vicino Oriente Antico attestato ad Ebla e ad Abū Salābīk(I)", *Orientalia* 47 (1978) 50–73 and pls. vii–xii; for a slightly different view, see Robert Biggs, "The Ebla tablets: an interim perspective", *Biblical Archaeologist* 43 (1980), 84 f.

³ William W. Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles: a Philologic and Historical Analysis* (= AOS 43, 1957) (hereafter EMRT).

⁴ EMRT pp. 66, 98.

⁵ EMRT ch. 2.

⁶ See for this evolution W. W. Hallo and W. K. Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: a History* (NY, Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1971) (hereafter ANEH), 34–53.

⁷ ANEH pp. 51, 73 f.; cf. also Hallo, "Gutium", *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 3 (1971), 709.

⁸ So CAD K 311b.

⁹ For a scheme incorporating all five regions, cf. ANEH p. 23.

respectively.¹⁰ It is found in early second millennium lexical contexts¹¹ and in epical contexts that may go back to the late third millennium.¹² But the earliest model of the concept, it has been suggested, may well be provided by the discoveries at Ebla. There a “quadripartite concept of the universe presumably typical of Ebla’s ideology” was expressed both in its figurative art¹³ and in the division of that city into four quarters.¹⁴ Although the title as such has not turned up at Ebla, it is certainly true that Naram-Sin claimed the (first) conquest of the city, and with it, conceivably, the right to adopt the concept for his own purposes. (The claim of his own grandfather Sargon to have preceded him in this conquest was conveniently ignored by Naram-Sin.)

Naram-Sin was also the first Mesopotamian king to accept deification in his lifetime, an honor bestowed on his grandfather and father only posthumously.¹⁵ (The votive seal of Taribu¹⁶ was dedicated to the deified Maništušu presumably after the death of that king, since it includes no [other] royal titles.) Royal deification was never well rooted in Mesopotamia, however, and may rather have represented an importation from abroad. The precise time and occasion in Naram-Sin’s reign for this drastic innovation, not only in the titulary but in the very conception of kingship, is difficult to determine.¹⁷ According to an intriguing new proposal by Jacobsen, it was “when the four quarters as one turned hostile toward him, (and) he . . . was victorious in nine battles . . . with them in one year (that) his city requested him as its protective deity from the major gods of the country”.¹⁸ Interestingly enough, this, the most explicit contemporary reference to the “great conspiracy”¹⁹ or “general insurrection”²⁰ occurs on the massive statue of Naram-Sin recently discovered at Bassetki in northernmost Iraq.²¹ It is unlikely that so heavy a monument would have turned up anywhere except at or near its original location, and one is therefore tempted to conclude that the assumption of the divinity title as chronicled on it was specifically linked

¹⁰E. F. Weidner and O. Neugebauer, “Die Himmelsrichtungen bei den Babyloniern”, AfO 7 (1931–2), 269 ff.

¹¹Cf. the Old Babylonian forerunners to HAR - r a = *hubullu* XXI edited in MSL 11:105: 309–14 (cf. *ibid.*, 132 vi 2–4) and the comments of Georges Dossin, “Kengen, pays de Canaan”, *Scritti* . . . *Furlani* (= RSO 32) 35–39 and W. H. Ph. Römer, “Studien zu alt-babylonischen hymnisch-epischen Texten”, WO 4 (1967), 19.

¹²See the “Golden Age” passage in “Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta”, lines 136–56, esp. 141–44, for which see most recently O. R. Gurney, AfO 25 (1974–77), 170 f. (with previous literature). Cf. also the “Curse of Agade”, lines 45–50.

¹³Paolo Matthiae, “Tell Mardikh: the archives and the palace”, *Archaeology* 30 (1977), 248. The reference is to seal impressions on clay bullae showing “a kneeling Atlas who holds, over his head, a complex symbol composed of two lion heads and two human heads in crosslike opposition”.

¹⁴*Ibid.*; cf. Pettinato 1976 (op. cit. note 2), 47 and, in detail, G. Pettinato and P. Matthiae, “Aspetti amministrativi e topografici di Ebla nel III millennio av. Cr.”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 50 (1976), 1–30.

¹⁵Hans Hirsch, “Die Inschriften der Könige von Agade”, AfO 20 (1963), 5, 16 *sub* “Das Nachleben . . . im Kult” and add W. G. Lambert, “A new source for the reign of Nabonidus”, AfO 22 (1969), 1–8 and Douglas Kennedy, “Realia”, RA 63 (1969), 79.

¹⁶Hirsch (op. cit. note 15), p. 16(3).

¹⁷See EMRT 59 f. for one estimate.

¹⁸“Iphur-Kišhi and his times”, AfO 26 (1978–9), 12 and note 45.

¹⁹So Jacobsen, *ibid.* and pp. 13 f.

²⁰So A. K. Grayson and E. Sollberger, “L’insurrection générale contre Naṣar-Suen”, RA 70 (1976), 103–28.

²¹A. H. Ayish, “Bassetki statue with an Old Akkadian inscription”, *Sumer* 32 (1976), 63–75 and 2 pls.; Tariq Madhloom, “Studies on Akkadian bronze statue”, *ibid.* (Arabic part), 41–48 and pls.; Fawzi Reshid, “Preliminary studies . . .”, *ibid.* 49–58 and pls.

to a triumph in those distant parts, perhaps over a northern opponent who had previously claimed the title. Conceivably this was Man(i)um king of Magan, who in an Old Babylonian account of the event, figures between the northern and southern groups of antagonists.²² Although it is now generally held that in the third millennium Magan lay far to the south and east of Mesopotamia,²³ rather than in the north, let alone in Egypt to the west,²⁴ it nevertheless is worth noting that the later historiographic traditions, which emphasized Naram-Sin's defeat of Magan,²⁵ equated this exotic land with Egypt which, in Old Kingdom times, was far more hospitable to the concept of royal deification than Mesopotamia ever became.²⁶

At the height of his powers, Naram-Sin entitled himself "mighty" (*dannum*) or, as I would now simply translate, "the great". Again we must dispose of alleged claims that he was anticipated in this by his father: the restoration of this title in the (forged) cuneiform monument of Maništušu²⁷ is far from certain;²⁸ and even if this portion of it has authentic precedent in real inscriptions,²⁹ these need not go back before Naram-Sin. But as already intimated earlier,³⁰ the latter may well have been anticipated in this usage by Epir-mupi and Kutik-Inšušinak (= Puzur-Inšušinak)³¹ of Susa. Although Hirsch has questioned the synchronism between Epir-mupi and Rimuš in the early Sargonic period³² and Boehmer now dates Epir-mupi to the late Sargonic or Gutian period,³³ there are equally compelling grounds for placing him in the high Sargonic period as an earlier contemporary of Kutik-Inšušinak and Naram-Sin³⁴ — among them the possible occurrence of the name (as patronymic!) already under Maništušu, as Boehmer himself first pointed out.³⁵ Whatever the precise chronological relationship of Epir-mupi and Kutik-Inšušinak to Naram-Sin (and to the unnamed vassal in his

²²Grayson and Sollberger (op. cit. note 20), 112 line 35 (Text G); Jacobsen (op. cit. note 18), p. 12 says he is listed there (!) "as a member of the northern coalition".

²³I. J. Gelb, "Makhan and Meluhha in early Mesopotamian sources", RA 64 (1970), 1–8.

²⁴Arthur Ungnad, "Der Akkader Narām-Sin und der Ägypter Mani", AfO 14 (1942), 199 f.

²⁵A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (= Texts from Cuneiform Sources 5, 1970), 154 and 224.

²⁶Ernest Posener, *De la divinité du pharaon* (= Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 15, 1960); Winfried Barta, *Untersuchungen zur Göttlichkeit der regierenden Könige* (= Münchener Ägyptologische Studien 32, 1975); but see the critique by David Lorton, "Towards a constitutional approach to ancient Egyptian kingship", JAOS 99 (1979), 460–65.

²⁷See e.g. Riekele Borger, *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften: 1. Teil* (= Handbuch der Orientalistik: 1. Abt., Erg. 5/1/1, 1961), 13 note 3.

²⁸Sollberger, "The cruciform monument", JEOL 20 (1968), 54 lines 5 f. restores [LUGAL / *da-nūm*].

²⁹W. W. Hallo and J. J. A. Van Dijk, *The Exaltation of Inanna* (= YNER 3, 1968) (hereafter YNER 3), 7 note 48.

³⁰EMRT 65 f.

³¹For the Elamite reading see Walther Hinz, "Zur Entzifferung der elamischen Strichschrift", *Iranica Antiqua* 2 (1962), 7 f. For another view see Wolfram Nagel and Eva Strommenger, "Reichsakkadische Glyptik und Plastik im Rahmen der mesopotamisch-elamischen Geschichte", BJV 8 (1968), 191 f., note 81.

³²Hirsch (op. cit. note 15), 61 *ad* 22:6.

³³Rainer Boehmer, "Zur Datierung des Epirmupi", ZA 58 (1967), 302–10.

³⁴Nagel and Strommenger (op. cit. note 31), 185–206. See especially the chart p. 205. Cf. also Walter Hinz, *The Lost World of Elam*, tr. by Jennifer Barnes (NYU Press, 1973), 74.

³⁵Rainer M. Boehmer, "Datierte Glyptik der Akkade-Zeit", *Vorderasiatische Archäologie* (= Festschrift Moortgat, 1964), 46, note 14. Cf. Hinz, CAH³ (1971), 650.

treaty with Elam),³⁶ the possibility remains that one or both of the Elamite rulers could have inspired the adoption of their distinctive title by the king of Akkad.

After Naram-Sin, the next great introducers of new royal titles were the kings of the Third Dynasty of Ur. Leaving aside a dubious “Ur-ur king of Sumer and king of Akšak”,³⁷ Ur-Nammu of Ur, in the course of his reign, first consciously proclaimed the union of south and north under his rule by means of the title “king of Sumer and Akkad”.³⁸ Not only was the title new, but the very idea of linking Sumer and Akkad, in spite of Sargonic efforts to this end,³⁹ is attested only in texts of Ur-Nammu and, to a lesser extent, Šulgi in the third millennium, according to Wilcke’s exhaustive survey;⁴⁰ the reference in Temple Hymn No. 2 probably dates to this same time.⁴¹

True, there was native precedent of sorts for double titles: in late Early Dynastic III times, royal claim to the rule over Sumer was often expressed by the double titles explicitly or implicitly alluding to Uruk and Ur.⁴² But at that time each unit rated its own title, e.g. “lord of Sumer and king of the nation”, or at least repetition of the title, as in “king of Uruk and king of Ur”, suggesting the idea of a true condominium. The model for a dual monarchy ruling over historically discrete parts may rather have come from further afield.

In the decades immediately preceding Ur-Nammu, Atal-shen ruled an extensive area of Hurrian settlement under the title of “king of Urkiš and Nawar”. This title, “which groups two cities distant from each other in order to designate the entirety of the land (of Subartu)”,⁴³ was recognized as an analogy to the Mesopotamian title by Parrot and Nougayrol.⁴⁴ Their further notion that it was borrowed from Ur-Nammu implies that Atal-shen was his (later) contemporary. Although this is not impossible,⁴⁵ it is preferable to regard Atal-šen, along with Diš-atal of Karahar and Diš-atal of Urkiš as all belonging to the late Sargonic period.⁴⁶ It has even been suggested that both names are synonymous, meaning “the moon god is strong” or the like.⁴⁷ If so it may be suggested that one and the same person ruled as *endan* of Urkiš and king of Karahar before uniting both realms and, conceivably, aspiring to (more) universal dominion. Although Ur-Nammu did not conquer the Hurrian frontier – it was left for his son Šulgi to wage repeated war there⁴⁸ – he may well have borrowed the idea of a double title from the Hurrian model when he was acknowledged by the priesthood at Nippur

³⁶Walter Hinz, “Elams Vertrag mit Narām-Sîn von Akkade”, *ZA* 58 (1967), 66–96.

³⁷D. O. Edzard, S. Farber and E. Sollberger, *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* 1 (1977), 10, 86 f. Cf. [E. F. Weidner (?)], *AfO* 8 (1932–33), 80.

³⁸EMRT 77–88.

³⁹YNER 3:9 f.

⁴⁰RAI 19 (1974), 202–32, esp. p. 224.

⁴¹Sjöberg, *TCS* 3 (1969), 18 (line 28); for the date, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 6 (A₁ and A₂) and 8.

⁴²EMRT 5 f.

⁴³Edmond Sollberger and Jean-Robert Kupper, *Inscriptions royales Sumériennes et Akkadiennes* (= *Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient* 3, 1971), 128.

⁴⁴André Parrot and Jean Nougayrol, “Un document de fondation Hurrite”, *RA* 42 (1948), 18 f.

⁴⁵I. J. Gelb, “New light on Hurrians and Subarians”, *Studi Orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida* 1 (1956), 381 dates Atal-šen’s inscription “either from the late Sargonic or the early Ur III period”.

⁴⁶*Ibid.* and Sollberger and Kupper (op. cit. note 43), 128.

⁴⁷André Finet, “Adalšenni, roi de Burundum”, *RA* 60 (1966), 17, note 9.

⁴⁸See in detail W. W. Hallo, “Simurru and the Hurrian frontier”, *RAI* 24 (= *RHA* 36, 1978), 71–83.

and crowned as sovereign of the two lands which flanked Nippur “to right and left”.⁴⁹

The other neo-Sumerian contribution to the royal titulary was Amar-Sin’s introduction, late in his reign, of the new title “mighty (or great) king” (l u g a l k a l a - g a). It was clearly inspired by the older title “mighty man” (or simply “the great”), which it replaced, but we are still entitled to ask for the proximate source of the particular substitution. Now Amar-Sin fought campaigns all along the eastern frontier, from Anšan in the south to Šašrum and Urbilum in the north. Thus he could well have come in contact with the Lullubi whose territory lay in the Zagros foothills, somewhere between the Elamite and Hurrian frontiers, even though he did not, like Šulgi, specifically claim to have defeated them.⁵⁰ The inscription of Annu-banini of Lullubum employs the new title, and should it “antedate Amar-Sin’s eighth year, we would then be forced to consider the possibility that the latter took the title over from Annu-banini by right of conquest, and that its origin lies outside the cuneiform tradition”.⁵¹

It may perhaps be appropriate to quote a private communication of W. G. Lambert made long ago in reference to this suggestion. “The Cuthaeen Legend of Naram-Sin can perhaps be considered as a very dubious witness to the date of Annu-banini. While there are certain obviously legendary features about it, there are others which imply a sound historical tradition. The moral to which the story leads up is quite irrelevant to the story, and shows that the writer has not manipulated his material for sermonising. Then the names of the kings, which could easily have become corrupt, show reduplicated types: mi-du-du etc., which are typically Old Akkadian. This then is some kind of evidence of a connection of Annu-banini with the Old Akkadian period. I am sure you will not put too much on it!”⁵²

Annu-banini is not specifically named king of Lullubum in the Cuthaeen legend;⁵³ on the contrary, the king of Lullubum identified by name in other literary-historical texts about Naram-Sin is now known to have borne the name *La-pa-na-i-la*⁵⁴ or [. . .]-*a¹-el*,⁵⁵ while a contemporary inscription speaks of a certain Satuni.⁵⁶ Thus Lambert’s caution is today as apt as when first expressed. But the possibility that Annu-banini antedates Amar-Sin has not been entirely ruled out by Edzard in his new edition of the inscription.⁵⁷ Therewith the introduction of yet another royal title from the periphery remains arguable.

The Old Babylonian period was considerably less productive of new royal titles than its predecessors. As the Ur III empire crumbled and its provinces reasserted their independence, they resorted to a complex “pattern of

⁴⁹ Above, note 41. Cf. Hallo, “The coronation of Ur-Nammu”, JCS 20 (1966), 134, note 22 and 138 f.

⁵⁰ Horst Klengel, “Lullubum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altvorderasiatischen Gebirgs-völker”, *MIO* 11 (1966), 349–71, esp. 352–54.

⁵¹ EMRT 98.

⁵² Letter of 10–31–57. Cf. also M. C. Astour, *JBL* 95 (1976), 574.

⁵³ O. R. Gurney, “The Cuthaeen legend of Naram-Sin”, *An. St.* 5 (1955), 93 f.; cf. also Hallo (op. cit. note 7), 709.

⁵⁴ Grayson and Sollberger (op. cit. note 20), 126.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 115:4’.

⁵⁶ SAK 166g; cf. Hirsch (op. cit. note 15), 17 (1).

⁵⁷ Dietz O. Edzard, “Zwei Inschriften am Felsen von Sar-i-Pūl-i-Zohāb: Anubanini 1 und 2”, *AfO* 24 (1973), 73–77. This represents a slight modification of his earlier position in *ZA* 54 (1961), 258 n. 2.

usurpation”⁵⁸ in which, while not initially claiming royal titles for their own rulers, they conferred them temporarily on the tutelary deity of their city, thus implicitly renouncing allegiance to Ur and its (deified) ruler. In the process, the hitherto subordinate titles expressing that allegiance inevitably began to assume the status of sovereign titles. The process is illustrated in the Early Old Babylonian period by the cases of *iššakku*⁵⁹ *šakkanakku*,⁶⁰ and *sukkalmahhu*.⁶¹ In the case of the *šakkanakku* – title at Mari, there is indeed the possibility that it had expressed independent status already before the end of the Ur III period, although the exact date and status of some of its bearers is still in doubt.⁶²

In the later course of the Old Babylonian period, however, one new royal title apparently entered Mesopotamia from abroad, namely *abu*, “father”. Its use by Kudur-mabug in connection with Emutbal can be traced to Elamite precedent under Šilhaha,⁶³ for the Emutbal in question surely lay somewhere between Elam and the kingdom of Larsa ruled by the sons of Kudur-mabug.⁶⁴ But he also called himself “father of the Amorite land (or mountain)” (*a d - d a k u r - m a r - t u*) and this suggests a possible western origin for the title. To quote Lambert once more: “Could not adda be an Amorite term in origin? I mean of course a rendering of the Amorite *Abu(m)*. Cf. Dossin, *Syria* 32, 27.”⁶⁵ This “Amorite *abu(m)*” is sometimes rendered by “sheikh” in modern translations,⁶⁶ thus implying an analogy to semi-nomadic or tribal leadership. Perhaps it continued to evoke such connotations in its brief Mesopotamian domicile.

Of the numerous royal *epithets* in vogue at one time or another in the long span of Mesopotamian history here reviewed, only one is a possible import from abroad, but it is a particularly significant one. “Effective (or faithful) shepherd” (*s i p a - z i*) is an epithet met with as part of a personal name already at pre-Sargonic Lagaš,⁶⁷ first conferred (in attributive position) on Gudea of Lagaš in the late Sargonic period, and not encountered again (in predicative position) until An-am of Uruk some three centuries later.⁶⁸ But Gudea may have been anticipated, if only by a few years, by Atal-šen of Urkiš and Nawar⁶⁹ who used an Akkadian epithet of approximately equivalent meaning, “experienced (?) shepherd (of the city?)” (*ri’um epšum* or *ri alim* [URU] *epšum*),⁷⁰ and who may have inspired also one of Ur-Nammu’s titular innovations (see above).

The epithet *s i p a - z i* was used predicatively again in royal hymns by

⁵⁸ ANEH 86 f. and n. 48 (with previous literature).

⁵⁹ EMRT p. 47.

⁶⁰ EMRT p. 105.

⁶¹ EMRT pp. 118–20.

⁶² Henri Limet, *Textes Administratifs de l’époque des šakkanakku* (= ARMT 19, 1976), 7–10.

⁶³ EMRT 108 f.; cf. M. Lambert, GLECS 9 (1962), 52 f.

⁶⁴ But Stol (JCS 30, 24 f.) regards it as denoting the territory around Larsa.

⁶⁵ Cf. above, note 52. The reference is to the “sheikhs of Hana” in the inscription of Yahdun-Lim of Mari.

⁶⁶ E.g. Edzard, *Die “zweite Zwischenzeit” Babylonien* (1957), 35 note 144; CAD A/1: 72 f.; Rowton Iraq 31:68 ff. Does it also apply to the summary of the second section of the Assyrian King List?

⁶⁷ Enannatuma-sipa-zi in CIRPL Enz. 1 and NFT 181:4156; see Sollberger and Kupper (op. cit. note 43), 75 f.

⁶⁸ EMRT 148.

⁶⁹ Ibid., note 2; cf. above, note 43.

⁷⁰ So CAD and AHW s. vv. *epšu*, *re’u* (following Thureau-Dangin’s *editio princeps*).

Šulgi of Ur⁷¹ and by Nur-Adad⁷² and Sin-iqišam⁷³ of Larsa. But its original, attributive use was revived only by the last member of that dynasty, Rim-Sin. He employed it in the date formulas of his twenty-third to twenty-sixth years, substituting it for the simple "shepherd" (s i p a) title which he had introduced in the name of his twenty-second year, apparently in connection with his conquest of Uruk. He used it also in a hymn.⁷⁴ It is therefore of interest that the same epithet may be bestowed on him⁷⁵ in the letter addressed to him by Nin-šata-pada, daughter of Sin-kašid of Uruk and high-priestess of Durum, in which she appeals to Rim-Sin, in words again borrowed from the king's date formulas, to spare Durum as he had previously spared Uruk. This letter, whose reconstruction is made possible in large measure by the contribution of Oliver Gurney,⁷⁶ may then serve to round out this tribute to my host at Oxford (1971–72).

⁷¹ A. Falkenstein, SGL 1 (1959) 53 *ad* 1. 60.

⁷² VS 17:41i21 = Van Dijk, JCS 19 (1965) 5:21.

⁷³ VS 17:38:44 = Sjöberg, *Or. Suec.* 22 (1973) 109:44; Dupret, *Or.* 43 (1974) 332:44.

⁷⁴ UET 6:101:19 and 38. Cf. H. Steible, *Rim-Sin, mein König* (1975), 48.

⁷⁵ Depending on the reading of line 3a as s i p a - z i k a l a m - š á r - r a t ú m - t ú m - m u - d è or s i p a z i k a l a m - š á r - r a t ú m - t ú m - m u - d è (OECT 5:25:61; cf. TRS 58:3).

⁷⁶ OECT 5:25 lines 59–112; for duplicates see for the present Hallo, Kramer AV (= AOAT 25, 1976) 211 f. and note 25. A full edition is in preparation.